Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No.

Schlumberger K.K.
Intellectual Property and Legal Department
2-2-1 Fuchinobe, Sagamihara-shi
Kanagawa-ken 229-0-006 JP JAPAN

AUG 1 1 2008

In re Application of :

Thomas J. Plona et al.

Application No. 10/789,210 : DECISION ON PETITION

Filed: February 27, 2004 : PURSUANT TO

Attorney Docket Number: : 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(B)

26.0273 US

Title: SLOWNESS-FREQUENCY : PROJECTION DISPLAY AND :

ANIMATION :

This is a decision on the petition filed March 13, 2008, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) is GRANTED.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R § 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed August 21, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. An afterfinal amendment was received on January 22, 2008, along with a petition for a two-month extension of time (it is noted that January 21, 2008 fell on a Federal holiday). An advisory action was mailed on February 20, 2008. No further extensions of time

under the provisions of 37 C.F.R § 1.136(a) were requested, and no further responses were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on January 22, 2008.

A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R.
 § 1.17(m);
- (3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

With this petition, Petitioner has submitted the petition fee, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with the associated fee, and the proper statement of unintentional delay.

The first three requirements of Rule 1.137(b) have been met. The fourth requirement is not applicable, as a terminal disclaimer is not required.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 - the amendment received on January 22, 2008 - can be processed.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the present decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the Technology Center in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to any failure of that change in status should be directed to the Technology Center where that change of status must be effected - the Office of Petitions cannot effectuate a change of status.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) $272-3225^{1}$. All other inquiries

¹ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written

concerning the status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
. Senior Attorney
 Office of Petitions

record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.